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In Appreciation of the Coordination Unit

A Coordination Unit plays a key role throughout the life of a Public-Private Dialogue (PPD), from start up to transition.

The most productive PPDs are characterized by a Dedicated Coordination Unit and Working Groups that meet often to devise recommendations for periodic plenary sessions and work regularly with relevant stakeholders to help implement and monitor these.

A Coordination Unit acts as a coordinator, administrator, facilitator, information manager, analyst, and advocate. It organizes meetings, coordinates research efforts, set agendas, rallies members, manages communication and outreach strategies, supports working groups in the implementation of reforms, monitors progress, and acts as the face of the PPD.

A Coordination Unit's facilitation role is crucial to the life and success of the PPD. It creates the necessary environment for reforms to be proposed, moved forward, and implemented.

A Coordination Unit is often referred to as the “engine” of the PPD.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBI</td>
<td>Better Business Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMO</td>
<td>Business Membership Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL4D</td>
<td>Collaboration Leadership for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEA</td>
<td>National Business Environment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBBF</td>
<td>Liberia Better Business Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI</td>
<td>Leadership, Learning and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA</td>
<td>Political Economy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPD</td>
<td>Public-Private Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPF</td>
<td>Private-Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Federation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Introduction

This Practical Note on implementation processes examines the practical elements that go into the design, implementation and management of Public-Private Dialogues (PPDs). This includes the efficient management of the Coordination Unit and its facilitation mechanisms, structural failures, the importance of organizing reform teams that improve the reform space, and designing a Coordination Unit up front with local capacity and sustainability in mind. A Coordination Unit can be informal or more structured and is also referred to as the “Secretariat” of a PPD.

Although there is no one-size-fits-all structure of successful PPDs, the most productive ones seem to be characterized by a dedicated Coordination Unit and Working Groups that meet often to devise recommendations for periodic plenary sessions, design solutions and work on their implementation.

The presence, or not, of a Coordination Unit has often been a topic of discussion among practitioners when considering the evolving nature of PPDs, which can take place at various levels within different timeframes. PPDs can address issues at local, national, or international levels, or be organized by industry sector, cluster, or value chain, all in an effort to promote better governance practices and collective action solutions to development problems.
They can also be time-bound (established to solve a particular set of issues) or institutionalized for in-depth transformation and development impact. PPDs can be categorized according to eight inter-locking dimensions, such as national vs. local, or economy-wide vs. sector specific, where the breadth of a relationship can be evaluated along a continuum, helping to guide the process (Figure 1.1).

A PPD’s institutional design is determined by a number of variables. Firstly, there is the private sector’s degree of organization, followed by other determinants, such as the power relationship of the executive vis-à-vis the legislature, the capacity and will of the private sector and the government, and the nature of the issues at hand. Depending on these elements, a Coordination Unit can mean that either government or private sector staff spend a few hours a week liaising with participating stakeholders, or it can entail a more structured group that is dedicated to managing the affairs of the PPD. In either case, the Steering Committee or sponsor of the PPD would still be there to drive, identify and adapt to these variables, while acting as a guide to move the reform work through an effective and impactful PPD process.

A PPD’s structure and participation can present a difficult balancing act. Too much formality in the structure can be stifling, while too little formality risks drift. Too many or varied participants can make dialogue practically unmanageable, while narrowing the range of participants increases the risk of capture and lack of balance. A PPD should be built on a strong foundation as a capable facilitator to avoid these challenges.

A Coordination Unit’s lead person can go by many different names: coordinator, manager, administrator, relationship manager, consensus builder, among others that reflects all the varied roles it plays. However, the role is most aptly described as facilitator. A Coordination Unit’s facilitation role is the most important one it performs. While functioning as a facilitator, the Coordination Unit acts as a neutral entity or “honest broker” that helps to

**FIGURE 1.1 Types of PPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Economy-wide</th>
<th>Permanent institution</th>
<th>Public-driven</th>
<th>3rd party brokerage/support</th>
<th>General orientations/many goals</th>
<th>Many actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific changes/specific goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector-specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally driven/sustained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2009, a global review was undertaken of all dialogue platforms worldwide being supported by the World Bank Group (WBG). A key factor explaining the higher performing PPDs within this network was the importance of an effectively operating and multi-tasking Coordination Unit. The Review stated: “The operation of a PPD Forum can be misleadingly simple; the truth is that it is awfully hard work, and where progress can often be extremely slow. Identifying and consistently bringing the right people to the table and ensuring a technically rigorous discussion involving a free exchange of ideas requires openness, objectivity, commitment, analytical rigor, trust, communication, information, political acumen, and a genuine belief that change is possible and that stakeholder inputs can actually make a material difference. In countries that have little or no experience with open dialogue or transparent decision-making, let alone countries that have just emerged from major conflicts that left behind profound physical, financial, sociological and psychological scars, this is a precious set of commodities. Also precious is the range of skills required in a Coordination Unit to continually merge people and issues, forge consensus, actively network, avoid political minefields, build trust, and keep decision-makers accountable. As Pham Lien Anh, Coordinator of the Vietnam Business Forum says, “you need to use contacts and relations, keep in touch closely with stakeholders, show them good facilitation, and build trust. Only then will they come to you for assistance.” And on top of all of this is the risk of major internal strife, such as in Chad, which can tangibly derail PPD efforts and WBG engagement. James Brew, who has run PPD Forums in Asia and Africa and currently advises on them, recalls from his experience “not everyone wants to do the administrative work. It’s tough to even get people to come to the table; you need to be a little pig-headed to get them to engage.”

Source: Herzberg and Toland 2009.

gather participants around common objectives and then assists with the planning of how to achieve the objectives (Box 1.1).

It creates the necessary reform environment for successfully promoting reforms to improve a country’s investment climate and competitiveness, as well as address social issues stemming from fragile and post-conflict settings, extractive industry practices, and those related to gender-specific challenges.
Chapter 2

Coordination Unit’s Structure

Although PPDs may have some operational differences (e.g., World Bank supported Presidential Investors Advisory Councils and Convergence Special Projects Initiatives), they typically share a common structure: a higher level governance body that can be called a Steering Committee or Governing Board, a coordination and facilitation support entity commonly referred to as the Coordination Unit or the Secretariat, and the operation of technical Working Groups (Figure 2.1) (Herzberg and Toland 2009, 5, 12).

2.1 Governing Body

A higher level structure known as a Governing Board, Steering Committee or Task Force exists within many PPD structures. It sits above the Coordination Unit and acts as a channel through which the reform efforts of the Working Groups are validated (or rejected), and then taken to the government to lobby for their implementation. (Herzberg and Toland 2009, 46).
The governing body includes representatives of the government, the private sector, and the supporting development partners (DPs) or sponsors. It plays a convening role at plenary sessions and provides directions in the development strategy of the PPD, including its transition to a sustainable path.

In general terms, Herzberg and Wright note in their 2006 publication that there is a consistent correlation between a PPD’s progress achieved and the seniority of government figures involved. This means that government participation should be at the highest possible level, as dialogues lacking explicit support from a President or Prime Minister seem to achieve less (Herzberg and Wright 2006, 60).

Nonetheless, ministry-level technical staff are vitally important participants, too. It is these officials who will eventually draft the laws recommended by the dialogue. As a rule, high-level political participation should be assigned at the plenary level while the government technical staff from ministries and agencies should be assigned to the Working Groups.

### 2.2 Technical Working Groups

Working Groups meet more frequently than Plenary Groups and they typically have a Chairman or Co-Chairs who interact with the Working Groups and the Coordination Unit.

Working Groups are usually organized by one or more of the following criteria: industry cluster (e.g., agriculture, tourism, or manufacturing), by policy issue (e.g., deregulation, infrastructure, or labor) or by geographical location.
This enables them to focus more effectively and call on greater levels of technical expertise.

Although this structure seems to be the most effective, a number of counter examples exist. Some PPDs, such as the Investors Council in Africa, or the Investors Round Table in the Kyrgyz Republic (2001–2004), had a plenary or high-level group of important government officials and businessmen, whereas committees on specific subject areas were mainly made up of technical experts with a very light Coordination Unit supporting the initiative. Although less rigid in their structure, they still achieved substantial results.

### 2.3 Coordination Unit

A PPD Coordination Unit is an administrative and facilitation unit. It can be formal or informal (depending on the nature of the PPD), housed in a ministry or a business association or performed by part-time staff. Typically, the Coordination Unit is characterized by a small team (2–3 persons), acting as an “honest broker” to provide support and to keep discussions focused, evidence-driven and moving forward.

The Coordination Unit is usually comprised of an executive director, technical expert and administrative support, but it can be expanded to include a communication specialist or a policy analyst.

Coordination Units generally respond to a Steering Committee composed of key senior stakeholders. It also coordinates and supervises the Working Groups, which feed policy recommendations into the plenary sessions.

Often but not always, the head of the Coordination Unit will act as the moderator of the official Working Group meetings. Because the facilitation role is known to be one of the most important determinants of a PPD’s success, the recruitment process for the head of the Coordination Unit should be a rigorous one, with the selection being a person who is neutral and trusted by both the government and the private sector (see the Appendix for TORs).

#### Correlation between an Effective Coordination Unit and a Successful PPD

According to Herzberg and Toland in their 2009 Global Review of World Bank Group (WBG) PPDs, an efficient and effective Coordination Unit is one of four particularly influential factors in determining a PPD’s success—others being: (a) the political will of the government to make reforms happen, (b) the capacity of the public and private sectors to engage, and (c) the presence of Champions. All of these factors were present in the “high performing” PPDs they reviewed in Vietnam, Cambodia, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Romania, Albania, Uganda, Bangladesh and Liberia.
In Romania and Albania for instance, they attribute the achievement of “substantial quantifiable benefits for the banking sector and the economy” to “a meticulous approach to Working Group membership, issue selection, development of Coordination Unit staff, and a strong analytic emphasis.” They call particular attention to the rigor used in their approach to hire and train the Coordination Unit staff, and in their adoption of an effective and sustainable transition strategy (Herzberg and Toland 2009, 25).

Herzberg and Toland find a strong correlation between the organizational effectiveness of the Coordination Unit and the results achieved by using a tool called an “Evaluation Wheel” that visually evaluates and measures different aspects of a PPD.

The Evaluation Wheel shows how well the Coordination Unit performs tasks along the 13 key processes of the updated “Charter of Good Practice in Using Public-Private Dialogue” (Box 2.1). The total score for a given PPD reflects the effectiveness of the processes put in place by the Coordination Unit, with 10 being the highest score.3

Herzberg and Toland also discuss the various modes of engagement and implementation of PPDs (Box 2.2). The format of IFC-supported PPDs, for example, is a structured dialogue between the public and private sectors involving mechanisms for both high-level engagement (a Forum which meets on average every 6 months) as well as technical engagement (Working Groups, typically composed of representatives of both the public and private sectors). All activity is coordinated by the an operational group commonly known as the Coordination Unit or Secretariat Unit.

**BOX 2.1 Thirteen Key Processes**

1. Contextual Design: taking into account various forms, levels, timeframes
2. Open Governance Process: functioning under open, transparent, and fair governance rules
3. Mandate and Institutional Alignment: stating objectives clearly
4. Structure and Participation: having a solid structure and representative participation
5. Facilitation: being facilitated professionally with dedicated staff and resources
6. Champions: having leadership from a set of individuals or organizations
7. Outputs: structure and process outputs, analytical outputs, soft outputs or recommendations
8. Outreach and Communication: enabling communication of a shared vision
9. Monitoring and Evaluation: demonstrating its purpose, performance and impact
10. Appropriate Area and Scope: tailoring to the set of issues to be addressed
11. Crisis and Conflict Response: mitigating entrenched interests, rebuilding trust
12. Development Partners: Benefiting from their input and support, partnership, coordination and additionality
13. Sustainability: sustaining the PPD platform by transferring its operations, management or financing from a development partner to local institutions

BOX 2.2 Variances in Structure—World Bank Group-Supported PPDs

- **Formation**—Some PPDs have been created by Presidential Decrees, while others have been established on the basis of memorandum of understandings (MOUs) signed by participating parties, including the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

- **Oversight**—The main oversight body can be either a large populated “Forum,” or a smaller number of senior officials within a “Task Force” or “Governing Board.” The main difference among these bodies being the degree to which they openly advocate to government for implementation of recommended reforms.

- **Working Groups**—In the more mature PPDs, Working Groups are supported by Sub-Groups as a way of breaking down an issue into more detailed components, and/or Private Sector Working Groups which allow the private sector its own space to develop its positions in advance of joint sessions. In the less mature structures, joint Working Groups have not yet been created or do not meet regularly.

- **Location**—The location of the Coordination Unit varies; it can be within a specific Government Ministry, but can also be within a private sector institution such as a Chamber of Commerce, directly within the development partner’s offices, or an independent location. In Cambodia, a separate Coordination Unit is established for each of the Working Group.

- **Government Coordination**—A small number of PPDs have within their structure a Government Coordinating Unit to act as liaison within Government to promote reforms.

*Source:* Herzberg and Toland 2009.

---

**CHECKLIST:** Good Practice Characteristics of the Coordination Unit

- The Coordination Unit is the “engine” of the dialogue process
- The Coordination Unit is more influential on a PPD’s success than any other actor
- The Coordination Unit is uniquely positioned to shape how stakeholders engage, and under what process and set of rules
- The Coordination Unit is very influential with regard to the PPD’s legacy and sustainability
- In setting the right example for transparency and evidence-based reform, the Coordination Unit catalyzes behavioral change among all PPD actors to help make them more effective institutions in their own right

---

**Notes**

1. “Sponsor” means in the context of this paper: development partners (DPs), public institutions, foundations, a consortium of private companies or a multinational which are providing “External party funding” i.e., financial (subsidies, grants) and technical support to a PPD.


Chapter 3

Coordination Unit’s Key Roles

A well-functioning Coordination Unit is one of the most critical determinants of a PPD’s success. Often called the “engine of the PPD,” its broad role is to mobilize and facilitate a constructive dialogue between the government and the business community, as well as other stakeholders, so that each contribute to sustainable economic growth and improve peoples’ lives.

The Coordination Unit coordinates, facilitates, and administers the PPD process as well as provides evidence-based inputs to the government and private sector on key strategic issues for private sector development. Its function is to organize meetings, coordinate research and logistics, set agendas, rally members, manage communication and outreach strategies, act as a point of contact for others who wish to participate and, above all else, facilitate the dialogue.

More specifically, the Coordination Unit is a multi-tasking presence that supports all organs of the PPD:

• **Administrative support**—this includes the planning, delivery and follow-up of all PPD meetings and events (e.g., logistics, agenda, materials, and minutes).
• **Facilitation**—this means keeping the dialogue moving forward, resolving sensitive issues, strategically engaging the PPD’s Champions, ensuring members deliver on commitments between formal meetings.

• **Information generation and sharing**—this refers to the management of relevant issues, programs and activities. The Coordination Unit can guide private sector associations in drawing information from their members and assist in the exchange of that knowledge in the form of reports, communities of practice and workshops, etc.

• **Analytical support**—this is the provision of descriptive and analytic information on current situations by analyzing options, carrying out impact assessments, and providing international comparisons and best practices on specific issues.

• **Advocacy**—this is how the Coordination Unit plays an essential role in developing and implementing a strategy for taking PPD recommendations forward to senior government decision-makers.

• **Outreach**—this is about keeping members informed of the PPD’s work and progress, drafting reports about the PPD for external audiences, and bringing the PPD’s work to the attention of the media.

• Provide **access to technical support** so that PPD issues forwarded to the government have a solid legal and economic foundation as well as support for their implementation.

### 3.1 Administrator

The Coordination Unit is responsible for the general administrative activities of the PPD. This includes the maintenance of a smoothly functioning office, the employment of local personnel, the drafting of TORs, and the training of staff.

The Coordination Unit requires sufficient capacity to carry out its administrative functions (capabilities and resources). For instance, it is recommended that a rigorous approach be used when hiring and training local staff. If the PPD is sponsored by an external party (DPs, public subsidies, grants, etc.), is staffed with consultants, and is expected to eventually transition to local management, it is crucial for the designated local replacement to be completely engaged in all PPD activities at a high technical level as early as possible. Furthermore, the sponsor’s presence should be maintained through capacity building, distance monitoring and possible funding. The local government and private sector should be full partners in any transition process.

### 3.2 Facilitator

In the context of this paper “facilitator” refers to the act of guiding people through a process. This means focusing on how people participate in the PPD process so that the group’s objectives are met effectively—with clear thinking, good participation and full buy-in from everyone involved.
The Coordination Unit’s role as a facilitator takes place on two levels: (a) Executive Director of the Coordination Unit may assist the Chairs of the Working Groups to facilitate the meetings, and (b) Coordination Unit works de facto to facilitate the PPD reform process through its day-to-day support of the official PPD—for its members, working groups, plenary and the administrative office itself (Box 3.1).

More specifically, as the original 2006 PPD Handbook states, the Coordination Unit organizes meetings (working group and plenary) and provides research and analysis to ensure a sound evidence base for discussions.

BOX 3.1 Multi-Tasking PPD Secretariat Unit: The Example of Albania

Launched in 2005 by the World Bank, the Convergence Program SPI focused on financial sector modernization through structured dialogue centered on micro regulatory financial sector reforms. Launched in Albania in 2008, in just six months the SPI Albania Secretariat was able to carry out the following:

- drafted Committee Operating Guidelines
- interviewed banks and authorities
- developed Background Notes & Drafted ToRs for specific issues
- built relationships with other international institutions
- designed and finalized Website layout and regularly updating it
- developed SPI Identity/logo
- organized Working Group and Steering Committee meetings
- participation in local and international meetings and conferences
- organization of advocacy meetings in support of specific reforms
- developed, disseminated and analyzed findings from questionnaires
- collected information from other government entities
- developed background notes on international experience
- compiled draft list of regulations
- organized presentation by Italian Association of Banks
- disseminated information to all Working Group members
- developed Scoping of the Problem document for all initiatives
- carried out RIA and organized seminars and training on RIA
- designed and administered questionnaires to banks in support of specific prioritized issues
- drafted invitation letters to individuals for participation in Working Groups
- drafted letters for PPD leaders to send in support of reforms
- summarized/aggregated Working Group members’ inputs and drafted their recommendations
- collected illustrative examples of banks’ difficulties with bailiff’s office
- sent documents to relevant authorities
- prepared information packages for Committee meetings; prepared and delivered internal lessons learned session for all PMTs

Source: Herzberg and Toland 2009.
It ensures that private sector input reflects broad representation, and it monitors the advancement of reform proposals and the implementation of agreements.²

Some helpful guidelines for organizing meetings, overcoming distrust among stakeholders, and ensuring subsequent activity follow.³

1. **Prepare and distribute an agenda of the meeting.** The Coordination Unit is responsible for preparing a coherent meeting agenda and any accompanying documentation on the issues to be discussed. The agenda should be distributed in advance to ensure participants have a reasonable amount of time for planning and preparation. The Coordination Unit should also have a clear goal and focus for each meeting so that its credibility is not undermined.

2. **Select a neutral but knowledgeable person to Chair the meeting.** At the beginning of the meeting, the Chairperson should explain the goal or purpose of the meeting and then adhere to it. This person should have the ability to ask precise questions and to pursue specific issues in search of causes and solutions to the problems.

   It is important for the Chair to maintain a balanced view throughout the discussions, so that the participants feel they are being given an unbiased forum in which to air their views. When necessary, the Chair should carefully step in and take sides, so as to solicit at least the understanding, if not always the support, of the participants. The entire staff of the Coordination Unit should be able to fulfill the role of a neutral but knowledgeable moderator.

3. **Take and distribute minutes of the meetings.** The Coordination Unit is responsible for taking meeting minutes. The minutes need not always be detailed, verbatim documentation, but it is very important that there be at least a summary of the main points discussed, a record of the commitments made (and the timeframe within which they will be implemented), and any points of disagreement. The draft minutes should then be distributed to the participating parties for commentary. Once comments are received (and if a party does not send comments within the agreed timeframe, the Coordination Unit may decide that “silence implies consent”), the comments should be incorporated, to the extent possible, in the final version of the summary of the minutes. A last step to ensure ownership by all sides would be the signatures of the participating parties.

4. **Consider carefully the participants of a meeting.** The general suggestions for the selection of dialogue partners (public and private sectors) apply when organizing smaller meetings as well. The Coordination Unit should extend private sector participation beyond those businesses or business associations that were selected as members of the Steering Committee. If a specific issue requires new representatives of the business community to be invited for discussions with the government, the Coordination Unit should provide suggestions.
3.3 Information Manager

The organizational and coordination skills of the Coordination Unit lend themselves well to the task of information management. Similar to many of its administrative duties, such as the preparation of and distribution of agendas and meeting minutes, the Coordination Unit acts as a clearing house of information and documentation as it passes from the Working Groups to Steering Committees, and goes out to single members or is presented at Plenary Sessions. The Coordination Unit manages the intake and outflow of pertinent information. It develops a communication strategy, elaborates informational materials and engages with stakeholders through traditional channels of communication or social media.

3.4 Analytic Support

An important feature of a Coordination Unit is to provide access to technical input. This ensures that issues forwarded to the government for discussion have a solid legal and economic foundation. Such analytical support can come from each party to the dialogue (with risk of biased analysis), the Coordination Unit (unbiased), or can be outsourced to local or international think tanks (hopefully unbiased), maybe through DP funding.

Analyzing options, carrying out impact assessments, and providing international comparisons and best practices on specific issues are among the analytic support the Coordination Unit provides to PPD participants.

3.5 Advocate

Advocacy is the method by which the Coordination Unit plays an essential role in the development and implementation of reform strategies that will be taken forward to the government. The Coordination Unit can train its members in the art of advocacy so that they also will have the capacity to approach the government or the private sector directly.

For example, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Regional Bulldozer Committees of the private sector were organized on a voluntary basis without financial support from the Bulldozer Coordination Unit. However, self-financing appeared in some regional committees, where funds were offered by entrepreneurs to conduct local advocacy awareness campaigns. These advocacy campaigns were directly in-line with the goals of their mission statement, thus helping to codify the goals that would eventually be operationalized (Box 3.2).

Similarly, the Nigerian Better Business Initiative’s (BBI) Mission Statement entailed a two-fold objective with Policy Analysis and Advocacy being its first priority (Box 3.3).
BOX 3.2 Mission Statement—Bosnia Bulldozer Initiative, Phase I

The Bulldozer Initiative is a mechanism to “bulldoze away” roadblocks to a good business climate.

Goals:
1. Improve the business climate by enacting much needed reforms
2. Organize the business community into an active lobby for reform

BOX 3.3 Advocacy—Nigeria’s Better Business Initiative (BBI)

The BBI has a twofold objective:

Objective 1: Practice Independent Policy Analysis and Advocacy

To help key stakeholders in the government and the private sector develop policy choices on key issues affecting growth and the diversification of the non-oil economy (for consideration by the incoming government). The Groups will:

- identify key constraints significantly affecting growth and competitiveness of the private sector
- highlight policy priorities and strategic choices confronting decision makers
- through further inquiry and deliberation, recommend creative solutions and policy instruments, to achieve desired outcomes
- inform public discussion of priorities, desired outcomes, strategic choices, and alternative solutions
- jointly explore overlapping issues and possible responses to them
- disseminate findings and recommendations to key audiences

Objective 2: Strengthen Nigerian Change Agents

Beyond these short-term aims lies the lengthier task of restructuring the Nigerian economy—one that will extend beyond the four-year span of the incoming government. Sustaining this effort requires informed support as well as monitoring by strategically positioned and credible stakeholders from within the country. Consequently, the second principal aim of the BBI is to foster the mobilization of autonomous, local constituencies for change. Success in this regard will be manifested by the progressive institutionalization of informed policy dialogue, and greater recourse to evidence-based decision making within the public sector.

Notes


Chapter 4

Coordination Unit as Facilitator

The Coordination Unit is in many ways the face of the PPD. Its job is to encourage a PPD, keep it moving forward, and diffuse any potentially contentious issues that may arise.

It should lead, but “lead from behind,” not actually directing the dialogue, but rather, putting in place the necessary reform environment to encourage stakeholders to equally participate over time, and move reforms forward.1

As the Facilitator, it should be the driving force behind the elaboration of the PPD and its Action Plan. Its role is to keep track of all ongoing PPD activities, such as convening and organizing meetings (Working Groups and Plenary), mediating meetings between private and public sector representatives, recording meeting minutes, keeping work focused on producing viable reform proposals, researching and analyzing issues, writing proposals for discussion, and formulating various implementation activities.

Recognizing the significant role facilitation plays, the PPD Charter of Good Practice Principle No. 5 is dedicated to the importance of the facilitation function (Box 4.1). It calls for the PPD process to be facilitated professionally.
with dedicated people and resources, thus allowing it to efficiently manage all aspects of the dialogue process with the goal of delivering results.

4.1 Key Facilitation Functions

Dialogue processes need to be facilitated to ensure progress is made. Meetings need to be arranged, participants invited and persuaded of the value of participating, and momentum maintained through the inevitable difficulties and changes. The Coordination Unit undertakes these responsibilities. The Coordination Unit must play the part of a neutral, “honest broker” trusted by both the government and the private sector.

As a meeting facilitator, with the proper qualities the unit can improve the prospects of a dialogue. These attributes include: organizational and logistical skills, negotiation capacity, creativity, transparency, responsiveness, knowledge of technical issues, an ability to easily engage with a wide range of participants—from ministers to micro-entrepreneurs to DPs.

The Coordination Unit’s role is to be particularly involved in the operation of the technical Working-Groups. Even though a technical working group may have an official Chair, it is the Coordination Unit that has the responsibility to provide support for the elaboration of an Action Plan, its implementation and the monitoring.

The preparation of a viable Action Plan and leading its implementation will require stakeholders to research suggestions coming out of Working

Group meetings, analyze legislation, and formulate acceptable proposals, sometimes with assistance or guidance from sponsors. These proposals can then be discussed in the Working Groups and altered as necessary. Because Working Group members may not have the resources to develop these proposals, the facilitation team’s support is vital. If the Coordination Unit has prepared evidence-based reports, stakeholders will be much more likely to react and comment on a pre-drafted proposal.

The Coordination Unit’s most important facilitation functions are:

1. To consult with stakeholders to determine their interest, willingness and ability to participate, and find ways of reaching out to foster broad representation from the private sector.
2. To work publicly and behind the scenes to lead the dialogue between the government and private sector counterparts (spotting opportunities, negotiating compromises and developing a shared agenda) and encourage the government to allow dialogue to play a role in new policy initiatives related to the private sector.
3. To liaise with the sponsors and DPs on the provision of necessary inputs, such as expert policy advice, independent evidence-based research, and specialized technical assistance to build the dialogue capacity of all participants.
4. To develop the agenda and vision for the dialogue, injecting it with energy while paying close attention to detail through accurate and transparent records and impartial and timely meeting summaries.

4.2 Practical Tips

The following are some practical tips for ensuring a successful facilitation practice.

Preparatory work between meetings is important to maintain momentum.
The Coordination Unit should do the preparatory work between meetings. This minimizes the risk of meetings being seen be as an energy-sapping waste of time.

Define the timetable well in advance and stick to it.
The Coordination Unit should make sure participants agree on a timetable—when each working group should deliver its input, when plenary meetings will take place, and when other events such as press conferences will take place. Clear timetables enable the participants to plan their time in advance. When communicated publicly they also create internal pressure on the participants to meet their own deadlines.

---

Facilitators need to work hard, be transparent and responsive

“It took me at least six months to build trust among the private sector when I arrived! Some of them would not invite me to meetings that were designed to discuss the proposed Working Group agendas. The best way to mitigate this has been to work hard, work with all parties, listen and be transparent. I also believe that being contactable and responsive is important.”

—James Brew, on the Cambodian Government-Private Sector Forum
Pay close attention to logistical details.
PPDs can be undone by a lack of attention to logistics. The Coordination Unit should make sure the agendas and supporting papers are sent out in good time and meetings are arranged at convenient times.

Facilitators hired by sponsors/DPs should stay at arms-length.
Often sponsor/DP money is necessary to hire Coordination Unit staff. When this is the case, the facilitator(s) should avoid being seen as narrowly driving the sponsor/DP’s agenda. The role of a facilitator is process-oriented, rather than policy-oriented. In general, it can be helpful for facilitators to adopt a low-profile approach.

Focus on process and “leading from behind.”
The Coordination Unit’s role is not to lead the dialogue but to encourage it. This can be difficult in instances when the facilitator can see a straighter path to a solution. But as the objective of PPD is to get the participants to solve issues themselves through dialogue, the temptation to lead from the front should be resisted. Patience is a great virtue.

Full and transparent documentation should be promptly available.
Facilitators need to foster an atmosphere of transparency and efficiency by ensuring that all meetings and activities are fully documented and that minutes and reports are sent to all stakeholders in a timely manner.

Privately resolve disputes between participants when mediation is needed.
A lot can be done by a good facilitator in managing expectations in private conversations before meetings, including: (a) Intimating privately to each of the two parties who are in a state of potential conflict that the other is prepared to take a conciliatory stance (the “divorced parents” strategy), and (b) Discussing with participants in advance when a disruptive contribution is expected, and seeking a general agreement to move on swiftly, heading off a reaction which would lead to a time-consuming detour from the agenda.

A high degree of professionalism is required.
The Coordination Unit must set a standard, exemplifying how to conduct a meeting and carry the process forward through building capacity and ensuring that participants understand the issues.

Coordination Units have to bring impartiality and transparency to the dialogue, and be trusted by all participants to be effective.

The role of the honest broker.
Coordination Units should be able to take the sting out of potentially difficult issues by first airing them

Awareness of local protocols is vital
“Facilitators should know how to handle the necessary local protocols and be sensitive to the underlying and often hidden issues, both technical and political, that might be impeding the dialogue.”
—Jason Agar, on Malawi’s Nat’l Action Group
in private. When the issue is significantly difficult for either party, tension can be skillfully defused with the first rush of anxiety being absorbed by the messenger. As many issues arise as a consequence of personality clashes, the facilitator needs to constantly focus people on the agenda at hand, and broker meeting dates and times to find a resolution.

**Facilitators should have industry experience while being politically savvy.** Coordination Units must explain to the government why their results-focused private sector counterparts may find it stultifying to deal with bureaucracy, while building a political awareness among the private sector about the realities of getting results through the dialogue mechanism.

**Choose the right facilitators for meetings.**

Often, a Working Group Chair (officially nominated) is a poor meeting facilitator. In such cases, the Coordination Unit's director must ensure that the person who is chairing each meeting is well briefed and supported with a focused agenda.

### 4.3 Facilitation Training

Coordination Unit staff should participate in trainings that will expose them to international best practice in PPD. They can do this by visiting successful dialogue mechanisms in other countries or requesting training and technical assistance from the international donor community. The WBG organizes an annual Global PPD Workshop to take stock of current PPD practices, be apprised of the goings on at various PPDs worldwide and to provide training. The most recent Global Workshop took place in Copenhagen, Denmark in 2015 and was hosted by DANIDA and the Confederation of Danish Industry.

Additionally, Coordination Unit staff can benefit from training in project management skills, mediation skills, or media skills that will teach them how to handle press enquiries and speak effectively on camera.

### Notes

4. For information on the Global PPD Workshops, available at [www.privatepublicdialogue.org](http://www.privatepublicdialogue.org) for information on all previous workshops and those upcoming.
Chapter 5

Improvement of the Reform Space

In line with the analysis of the World Development Report 2005 (World Bank 2005), and on the premise that “workable reforms are reforms that work,” we approach PPD as “discovery institutions” that can increase the reform space and help manage reforms within that space.

This is no easy task, however. Although early rounds of economic reform were often seen as one-off events, in actuality reforms are ongoing processes, more akin to a marathon than to a sprint. Reforms require regular review to take into account changes in business conduct, government policy, and acknowledge lessons learned. Reforms must be prioritized, managed, and encouraged, all while strengthening government and private sector capabilities.

And so, the primary focus of any PPD Coordination Unit is to create the right enabling environment for promoting reforms. It should be specific to the political economy (PE) context and the reforms at hand. Whether intended to improve the investment climate, competitiveness, or to introduce a gender perspective into policy and practice, a PPD Coordination Unit is a facilitation unit that establishes and manages a space amenable to reforms.
PPD practitioners today go further than simply creating and maintaining reform environments, they look at the “how to” of improving that space and making their work more impactful.

At the 2015 Global PPD Workshop in Copenhagen, many discussions took place around reform implementation. These came out of a series of interactive sessions that asked questions, such as: Why are recommendations not always implemented? How can follow-up be improved? Are the reforms too complex? Is there an inherent lack of commitment and, if so, from whom? Is the PPD Inclusive enough? Is the PPD impermeable to state or private sector capture? What needs to be done?

The answers to these questions are categorized around the overarching building blocks of an effective reform environment: (a) building trust, (b) promoting inclusion, (c) preventing capture (d) collaborating with stakeholders, (e) improving communication & mediation, and (f) agreeing on structure and goals.

Although patience and persistence are the main course of action for PPD coordinators, new approaches to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the reform environment are being suggested. Some of these approaches are as simple as reminding the government and the private sector of the benefits and positive outcomes of the reform effort in order to instill a renewed sense of commitment, or collaborating with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and universities as a means to tap into their particular area of expertise.

More complex issues, however, require more complex interventions. For instance, adopting reforms that are too large in scope or too complex, making them very challenging to implement and high stake, often result in low levels of commitment and fewer implementation results. In such cases,

---

To this end, the recently revised Public-Private Dialogue Charter of Good Practice stipulates in Principle 7 that the Coordination Unit should “follow up on reforms discussed, helping stakeholders organize reform teams to develop a work plan and monitor or assist for results. These may include rapid result initiative approaches or result-based management techniques.”

---

CHECKLIST How a Coordination Unit Creates the Reform Environment

- Build trust
- Promote inclusion
- Prevent capture
- Collaborate with those within the PPD and those outside (NGOs, Universities)
- Improve communication and mediation
- Agree on structure and goals
ambitious reforms need to be deconstructed into more manageable and easily implementable pieces.

In Tunisia, local ownership is the solution to this problem and many others. Tunisian experience shows that reforms are not necessarily too complex if there is a strong sense of local ownership, coupled with strong public accountability to pave the way for more implementable actions. In other words, in Tunisia, using Parliament to instill more public accountability makes the government exert more pressure on the administration, resulting in follow-up and reform implementation.4

What follows provides more detail and some examples of the reform space building blocks in practice.

5.1 Build Trust

Building trust is a fundamental basis to all relationships, PPDs included. PPD relationships need to grow organically over time, so don’t rush an agenda in its beginning phase, especially when former adversaries are coming together, such as in a post-conflict situation. Consider bringing in civil society organizations (CSOs) that are seen as neutral, third-parties that can create sincerity and help the government see from the perspective of businesses and citizens.

In Bangladesh, trust is crucial to the process. The PPD platform must have credibility among its stakeholders in order to be influential, therefore it works with civil society, businesses and the government. Many times, however, action plans do not come to bear due to the differing backgrounds and interests of the PPD stakeholders. For this reason it is important to be flexible—oftentimes plans can be changed in order to achieve common goals. The Bangladeshi experience also suggests that language plays a very important role in the trust-building process.

In Jordan, a trust building exercise took government officials on a tour where problems and issues were discussed on the ground, and the Chamber of Commerce acted as the mediator between members and the government.

An example from Kenya showcased how trust can be built by illustrating the benefits gained from PPD, while in Macedonia, former Yugoslav Republic of, people in the public sector and private sector simply did not know each other, and so conducting PPD at an operational level, where officials and technocrats met directly and discussed the issues at hand was beneficial.

In Mauritania, a local PPD platform for the fishing sector was created where civil society, the private sector and local government worked together, bringing all affected actors to the table.

International Finance Corporation’s (IFC’s) experience in Cambodia shows that building trust between participants could have been better achieved by expanding the membership of the project so that old “enemies” could constructively engaged with each other.
5.2 Promote Inclusiveness

Inclusiveness of the PPD Coordination Unit and the business organizations is an important factor of their capacity, as it is a matter of fair representation (Box 5.1).

In Kenya, for instance, sector Working Groups have been created, but as a matter of practice, it is the business organizations that decide who participates in these groups. Working Group invitations go directly to the Business Membership Organizations (BMOs), which then decide which private sector members should participate. This means that the capacity of the Kenyan business organizations determines the entire selection process.

A good example of representation comes from Nepal, where by using both bottom-up and top-down approaches, advancements were made that institutionalize representation and ensure that all voices are heard.

5.3 Prevent Capture

Reform capture is possible within both the public and private sectors, and so building the capacity of the PPD Coordination Unit and other actors to engage all participants effectively, ensuring a rigorous and transparent process, and addressing inclusivity at an early stage, are important steps to dissuading capture (Box 5.2). A Political Economy Analysis (PEA) can identify who wins and who loses in the process, making it a critical step and thus is critical in establishing a PPD or promoting a reform.

What Steps to Take Regarding Participation?

Begin with stakeholder assessments by properly mapping the stakeholders. Everyone and everything must be identified in order to better understand who will and will not support the various reforms on the agenda. Surveys and analysis are also helpful tools as well as people on the ground, who are “in the know” and can advise on what is trending in societal and political arenas.

---

**BOX 5.1 Steps to Ensure Inclusiveness**

1. **First Step:** Conduct a stakeholder assessment through a Stakeholder Mapping exercise to ensure that all stakeholders affected are identified, and to better understand their likely engagement and support.
2. **Second Step:** Ensure small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) inclusion by engaging representative bodies with significant numbers of SMEs as their members.
3. **Third Step:** Balance efforts between Champions and others to ensure inclusivity by understanding the political economy of the situation and involving people with “ears to the ground.”
4. **Forth Step:** Complete the “inclusiveness circle” by including the community and NGOs (and the disempowered).

*Source:* Global PPD Workshop, Copenhagen, 2015.
Ensure public sector Champions have sufficient independence from political pressure. This can be difficult. In Serbia, for example, it is always about walking a fine line, especially when engaging with the labor unions. In Indonesia, a framework to help minimize the risk of capture is being developed, however, the geographical spread makes this a challenging endeavor. In general, the private sector will always need to make a business case for its engagement, as it is chasing profits. It can only be brought to the table if a strong compelling business case for reform is made.

The Coordination Unit should be involved in the identification of stakeholders selected to participate because exclusion and capture are closely related. In Iran, for example, consultations are held but they are not binding, and there are transparency issues when prioritizing reforms because stakeholders hold different opinions and vested interests in different fora.

Public and private sector co-chairs for sectoral committees can help ensure better inclusiveness.

PPD working groups have to be open and transparent. All actors should be involved in the analysis of proposals and both the public and private sectors should educate the media through more open communication channels.

5.4 Collaborate

Working on a collaborative basis can really bring the reform process forward. Some elements of planning can help, but it is often an organic process that needs time (Box 5.3). Collaboration can help resolve some of the issues faced...
when it is difficult to clearly identify the lines of authority. Who should take charge—government? private sector? civil society? media?

In Egypt, everyone wanted to “own” the different reform agendas and topics, such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), women’s empowerment, etc. This meant there was a problem of too much individual ownership. In Uganda, there was a problem with coordination—all the branches of government and the NGOs had their own approach for dealing with environmental problems. World Wildlife Federation (WWF), however, eventually brought all the parties together to devise a single approach. Through WWF’s facilitation, a constructive dialogue was created that brought in the right players at the right time, allowing for a collaborative solution.

5.5 Improve Communication and Mediation

Communication strategies are crucial in sending the right messages in order to pursue the reform agenda. Communication puts things into context by tying issues to jobs, prosperity and other important issues that people care about. In terms of communication strategy, it must go beyond the regular Working Group meetings by increasing frequency and quality, and by expanding its scope beyond the PPD. More visualization and communication between meetings can be conducted through interviews and surveys, among other things, to keep the conversation going.

Language used can also be a very important tool. For example, power words such as “we,” “win-win” or “industry” are helpful in gaining credibility.
5.6 Agree on Structure and Goals

Consensus may be ideal, but agreement is realistic. In order to conduct effective dialogues that will result in meaningful reforms, the ground rules of conduct, the basic structure of the PPD and what it is trying to achieve must be firmly anchored and agreed upon.

For instance, in Denmark, PPD is rooted in local needs and very often it depends on civil society facilitation. In Morocco, the National Business Environment Committee (CNEA), considers investors and entrepreneurs as their final customers and engages them in the entire decision-making process (from creating the action plan to the final output). In Namibia, the PPD facilitates processes where stakeholders are brought together in the retail sector—which is very fragmented and not very transparent. In each of these scenarios the models and goals of the PPD vary widely as well as those of their individual stakeholders. However, the way to overcome these diversions is to build trust and engage all stakeholders in finding common ground and a path toward the shared goal. Clarifying commitments up-front is very important. Sharing a cost-benefit analysis among all stakeholders can be beneficial. Raising awareness of what has been accomplished and what is left to do can be instrumental in pushing the reform process forward.

Notes

2. Ibid.
Chapter 6

Building Reform Teams

As stipulated in Principle No. 7 of the revised PPD Charter of Good Practice, the organization of reform teams to enhance the Coordination Unit’s facilitation role will increase the effectiveness of the Coordination Unit and the Working Groups, thereby increasing the productivity and quality of their reform outputs.

The importance of creating reform teams is directly related to the questions previously stated in the section above: Why are recommendations not always implemented? How can follow-up be improved? Are the reforms too complex?

After undertaking internal assessments of PPD Coordination Unit functions and considering the lessons learned from many PPD Coordination Units worldwide, the implementation of reform teams as a means to follow-up on ideas and proposals coming out of Working Group sessions and to increase the productivity of these groups, was agreed upon and codified in the “Charter of Good Practice in Using Public-Private Dialogue for Sector Development and Inclusive Growth” in 2015.

The notion of reform teams is not new. It has been known to both the public and private sectors for many years. According to a 2008 publication on reform teams by Alberto Criscuolo and Vincent Palmade for the WBG: “Dedicated, multi-skilled change-management teams are common in the private sector.
Companies rely on them to effect radical change, such as launching a new product or turning around a loss-making operation. Governments typically use them in times of crisis, such as during a war or after an earthquake (Criscuolo and Palmade 2008, 3–4).

In the context of international development, Benjamina Randrianarivelo of the WBG presented on the importance of reform teams at the 2014 Global PPD Workshop in Frankfurt, Germany. He described his work with the “Leadership For Results” Framework (Figure 6.1) and identified the key issues undermining the efficiency of coalitions and teams as: (a) lack of organization, (b) lack of mutual trust, (c) lack of capacity (including continual change, no commitment), (d) lack of mechanisms for implementation, (e) weak coordination and/or follow-up, and (f) no mechanisms for sustaining the partnership.¹

The WBG Collaborative Leadership for Development (CL4D) program is an in-depth program that supports multiple reform teams addressing the same overarching challenge in a single country. It offers reform teams a platform for shaping a credible in-country coalition, converging on a common vision, and then translating this into an actionable plan that will produce results. CL4D rests on client ownership and is result focused.

**FIGURE 6.1** Collaborative Leadership for Development Framework

![Diagram of Collaborative Leadership for Development Framework](source: WBG 2014.)
The starting point is to address the “how” of reform. Most often implementation challenges are adaptive in nature and cannot be dismissed as part of weak governance, low capacity or even lack of political will. So far, the bulk of development work has focused on finding technical solutions to problems—starting with diagnoses of “what’s wrong,” recommendations of “good practice,” and assistance toward transplanting those “good practices.” When it comes to capacity building, however, practitioners need mainstreamed tools and tactics that address the “how” for going from diagnostics to development results via concrete implementation support.2

The following is an excerpt from the WBG 2008 “Public Policy for the Private Sector Note” on Reform Teams.3 It was considered a first-step in understanding “reform teams” and how they might be incorporated into development initiatives, and whether the model would apply to such large economies as Brazil, China, and India. The Note examines the exceptional economic growth cases of five countries (Cape Verde, Mauritius, Malaysia, Botswana, and Taiwan, China) and their commonalities, which include their employment of “reform teams” shortly before or after gaining independence.

According to the Note, reform teams were embedded in the policy process while simultaneously being relieved of their daily administrative duties. Teams were one step removed from the political frontline in order to leverage scarce technocratic expertise, maximize impact on policy formulation, and perform the key functions of reform teams.

What follows are the six key functions of reform teams that are applicable to international development strategies.

### 6.1 Six Key Functions of Reform Teams4

1. **Designing development strategies.** The reform teams were charged with designing comprehensive yet focused strategies, often in preparation for or soon after independence. Focus was essential since the teams lacked the capacity to fix all problems at once.

   Following initial attempts at import substitution policy that led to mixed-growth outcomes, all the reform teams settled on export-driven strategies that focused on the industries with the strongest export potential, which included: mining and food processing in Botswana; tourism and fishing in Cape Verde; apparel, sugar, and tourism in Mauritius; and light manufacturing and information and communication technology in Malaysia and Taiwan, China.

   The reform teams identified key constraints and success factors by industry, such as: a) ensuring good governance in mining, b) developing best-practice export processing zones for light manufacturing, and c) information and communication technology. They also adapted strategies to changing conditions (e.g., rising labor costs) and terminated bad experiments (Taiwan, China, is one of the few economies ever to abandon an ailing automotive assembly industry).
Finally, the team’s development strategies always included a fundamental “social contract” with citizens on better health, education, and infrastructure. This not only ensured social cohesion but also aided the competitiveness of industries.

2. **Leading the dialogue with the private sector.** Economic policymaking required the reform teams to lead an intense but arm’s-length relationship with the private sector. The team in Mauritius, for example, strategically engaged the sugar industry in pursuing access to international markets on favorable terms. And Botswana initially relied on the entrepreneurial class of cattle ranchers (the “beefocracy”) to advocate for an export-oriented, private sector–led strategy of modernization.

   This approach required reform teams to combine top-notch knowledge of industries with rigorous economics—a mix that led to creative and sometimes explosive tensions—such as the legendary “showdowns” in Taiwan, China between the Economic Research Unit and the Sectoral Planning Department of the Council for Economic Planning and Development (formerly the Council for U.S. Aid) (Wade 1990).

   In all cases, the autonomy and apolitical nature of the teams enabled them to engage with the business community while avoiding the risks of capture by dominant interest groups—what Evans (1995) would call “embedded autonomy.”

3. **Grooming political leaders.** A sound development strategy is worth little if it is not backed by outstanding political leadership that is able to make tough decisions and discipline often reluctant administrations. Fortunately, the five reform teams benefited from outstanding political leadership, where the continual and almost symbiotic engagement of reform teams with top political figures helped groom several generations of political leadership. For example, Botswana’s first president laid the groundwork for sound mining policies when he waived his own tribe’s mining rights (through the historic Mines and Mineral Act of 1967) to the benefit of the national government. Thereafter, Botswana’s second and third presidents, Quett Masire and Festus Mogae, respectively, had both worked with the reform teams in their former government capacities. Masire, for instance, had led the Economic Planning Unit while Mogae had led the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning during the reform team’s time of operation in Botswana. Similarly, the second chairman of the Council for U.S. Aid, C. Y. Yen, later became president of Taiwan, China (Wade 1990), and Pedro Pires, the team leader in Cape Verde in 1975, served as the president of the country for 10 years.

4. **Leading critical policy negotiations.** The reform teams brought unique skills and expertise to bear in key negotiations. These included negotiations with foreign companies on mining concessions in Botswana and with large U.S. electronics companies on the acquisition of technology licenses in Taiwan, China—and negotiations on access to the European market and on more flexible labor rules for exporting companies, both in Mauritius.
5. **Mobilizing and allocating resources.** The teams played a key part in mobilizing resources for implementing strategies, particularly by coordinating donor support. In Taiwan, China, for example, the Council for U.S. Aid managed U.S. aid flows while in Malaysia the Malaysia Economic Planning Unit was in charge of the development budget, which amounted to a third of the national budget. Furthermore, Cape Verde’s Ministry of Planning was in charge of mobilizing donor support. One method it utilized was to create competition between donors by assigning each an island. Similarly, Botswana’s Ministry of Finance and Development Planning put donors in charge of the performance of different industries (e.g., Canada for mining and the United Kingdom for agriculture).

6. **Compelling the administration to act.** These central, dedicated reform teams were in an ideal position to monitor progress and suggest corrective actions to the national leadership. Indeed, their unique combination of monitoring capacity and access to the top (the stick) and financial and technical resources (the carrot) enabled them to compel the administration to act.

They also experimented with different organizational drivers, such as expatriates embedded in line positions (Botswana), cross-departmental task forces (Taiwan, China), staff exchanges (Mauritius), and tight-knit networks of policy officials (Cape Verde). Implementing agencies had little choice but to come to specific agreements with the reform teams on implementation targets, budgets, and responsibilities.

---

**Notes**

4. Ibid.
Chapter 7

Coordination Unit’s Budget

Throughout the lifespan of the PPD (from the time of initial set-up through the transfer phase to local ownership) a PPD will face different budget requirements. These will include its initial start-up costs, its day-to-day activity costs, and its transition to local ownership and maintenance costs.

When initially setting up a PPD, the Coordination Unit may require external funding from DPs or other sponsors. DPs can play an important role by providing seed funding and support for technical capacity building—but DPs must be extremely careful not to foster dependence and make BMOs responsive to donor needs rather than the needs of their members. Sponsor/DP funding should also take into account associated risks and actual capacity.

Often, sponsors’ and PPD time horizons will not match due to bureaucracy that makes sponsors slow-moving and inflexible. To mitigate this the Department for International Development has, for example, had success in promoting PPD by setting up independent trusts and “challenge funds,” such as the “Business Linkages Challenge Fund” in the United Kingdom, which are more capable of responding to changing opportunities. Also promising is the use of local trusts as a means to bypass project cycles to synchronize better with PPD requirements. Challenge funds, too, can serve this purpose, but only if
they can be given a long enough lifespan to establish their presence and streamline their procedures.1

In general terms, sponsors should develop more flexible and less time-bound approaches to promoting PPD. They should adopt a more venture capitalist attitude towards PPDs by treating PPD as a high-risk but essential investment, one that will require innovation and experimentation and a healthy tolerance for failure.

Similarly, the sponsors’ investments need an exit strategy right from the start. Initial external funding for set-up should be acknowledged as short- to medium-term start-up funding, and not as long-term support for the lifespan of the PPD.

As part of a “transition strategy,” sponsors may decide to provide a grant to the “new” Coordination Unit of the PPD so that it can be operational for the first year or two. In this case, the sponsors and the PPD Coordination Unit need to understand clearly what their role is, responsibilities are, and what outputs are expected from this grant.

In the Lao PDR and Cambodia PPDs, for example, IFC provided a grant to sustain the Coordination Unit. This grant mainly focused on the “infrastructure” of the PPD Coordination Unit and covered the salary of one key staff person. In Cambodia, the grant was of (US$) 10 thousand for each association, thus allowing for investment in equipment necessary for the functioning of the Coordination Unit (computer, translation sets, recorder, etc.). For the Lao Business Forum, IFC provided the salary for the office coordinator for three years.

7.1 Budgeting for the Coordination Unit and Day-to-Day Activities

For a structured PPD Coordination Unit, the budget may include the following:2

- **Salary of one or two PPD coordinator(s) or facilitator(s).** Having two facilitators (a junior and a senior one) ensures continuity in the event one facilitator leaves the partnership. It also enables specialization, i.e., facilitators may decide to split the agenda so as to work more intensely with some working groups and less with others.

- **Salary or consulting fees for technical experts.** Legal and economic expertise is crucial to the success of any PPD project. Proposals that get processed through the consultative mechanism need to be solidly documented and grounded in the existing legal framework, as well as in good practice in term of business environment improvement. Ideally, a lawyer and an economist would be on the PPD staff, but costs may warrant hiring consulting expertise, as needed. If budget is available for one of the two staff positions only, the lawyer should be on staff and the economic technical expertise should be on hire (the nature of issues forwarded through a PPD mechanism is often regulatory in nature).
• **Salary for an office assistant.** Person in-charge of logistics, procurement, and eventually translation.

• **Operating costs.** This is strongly influenced by the settings in which the Coordination Unit evolves. If the Coordination Unit is hosted by an existing structure (governmental office, business association, donor’s office), operating costs may be lower. But starting from scratch, operating cost should include: office rent, communication budget, computer equipment and connections, transport, etc.

• **Activities cost.** Depending on the output of the Coordination Unit, the budget will vary. A Coordination Unit that outputs a professionally edited and printed brochure after each major activity should plan for such extra cost and time. The number of planned meetings, conferences, workshops, luncheons, communication campaigns, etc., should be carefully considered, as each activity will bring a burden in term of logistics, human resources, external providers, consultants, and therefore cost.

It is difficult to predict a typical budget for a Coordination Unit due to unpredictable variables, such as the cost of international staff or delocalized expertise that carry a much higher cost than utilizing local expertise. The following, however, does provide a few examples of PPDs and their budgets:

• In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the **Bulldozer Initiative** (50 reforms per phase) cost about (US$) 150,000 per phase

• In Sierra Leone, planning for the **Sierra Leone Business Forum** cost about (US$) 250,000 per year, including office setup and heavy communication and advocacy budgets

• In **Cambodia**, the operating cost, salary and activities in total is about (US$) 250,000–300,000 per year

• In **Vietnam**, the partnership runs with less than (US$) 100,000 per year (IFC absorbing a lot of the costs)

---

**Notes**


Chapter 8

Operational Challenges—Where Can It Go Wrong?

A PPD global review notes that “a PPD poses special challenges in developing countries and/or post conflict environments, it is demanding on people’s time, must confront major attitudinal gulfs between the government and the private sector, and is typically undertaken in countries where there are huge institutional capacity shortages, strong political influences, and limited commitment to reform (Herzberg and Toland 2009, 6–7, 37).”

The Report goes on to say that, “while the support on PPD provided by the sponsor addresses some needs of the country teams in terms of Framework, Knowledge Management, and Monitoring & Evaluation, the local PPD teams are still faced with large operational challenges when it comes to supporting a PPD on a day-to-day basis.”

Those working on the ground in the PPD Coordination Unit must be cognizant of these larger considerations and how they may affect their day-to-day work. Below we list some of the day-to-day operational challenges that a PPD may face and how the Coordination Unit can address them.

An unmanageable agenda—PPD members can be expected to contribute a wide range of reform ideas. The Coordination Unit needs to strike a balance...
between encouraging input and pushing back when suggestions are either not consistent with the PPD’s mandate, national strategic plans or issue selection criteria, or they threaten to overwhelm the PPD’s ability to address them.

**Limited activity between meetings**—The importance of Steering Committee and Working Group meetings notwithstanding, it is the engagement of PPD members in-between these meetings—usually by reaching out to their respective constituencies for information or validation—that moves a PPD agenda forward. The Coordination Unit can play a key role in partnering with PPD entities to reach out to their respective memberships.

**Overly ambitious activity planning**—An early task of a PPD is development of an Activity Plan, centered on the main issues or themes that the PPD has prioritized. Sometimes, however, and largely due to the enthusiasm of stakeholders, the range of themes or activities is ambitious. This can put significant early pressure on the PPD to deliver and can tarnish expectations of stakeholders if the actual delivery is not keeping pace with the plan. The Coordination Unit must work with the PPD leadership to ensure that the Activity Plan is realistic and achievable, particularly in the PPD’s early phase.

**Inadequate communication and outreach**—Stakeholders can sometimes be dissatisfied with the limited amount and frequency of information being shared about the PPD’s activities. This information gap can weaken local ownership of the dialogue process and slow down early momentum. It is the direct responsibility of the Coordination Unit to ensure regular information sharing with stakeholders.

**Limited engagement of PPD leaders**—Sometimes it can be challenging to approach leaders of the Steering Committee or Working Groups due to their seniority within their respective institutions. Yet, their engagement is often critical to resolving certain issues or impasses within a PPD and/or reaching decision makers on the Private-Public Forum’s (PPF’s) behalf. It is the function of the Coordination Unit to not only strategically engage these PPD leaders, but to also make it as easy as possible to engage with them.

**Lack of Member clarity about their roles**—When members, particularly of Working Groups, do not clearly understand their roles, reform momentum can stall. This includes their contributions to Working Group and Steering Committee deliberations, and engagement with their own respective constituencies. The Coordination Unit needs to continually remind members of their obligations and commitments as PPD members, and offer to help them effectively play these roles, when needed.

**Lack of disciplined activity tracking**—A PPD can become immersed in a range of activity quite quickly, with each element of its program moving at a different pace. Not keeping on top of this varied pace of activity can add confusion into a PPD and derail reform efforts. The Coordination Unit must develop and apply a system to keep track of the PPD’s activities and to make this information as readily available as necessary.

**Unconvincing and/or inconsistent presentation of reform proposals**—After what is often considerable effort in reaching consensus on a specific reform, the effort can be harmed if the actual content and presentation of the proposal fails to attract government attention. This is where the Coordination Unit can play a key role in partnering with PPD entities to reach out to their respective memberships.
Unit can introduce a consistent format for the content of reform proposals that makes them stand out as prioritized reading for government officials instead of being “lost” on a bureaucrat’s desk.

The Coordination Unit lacks a daily/weekly Activity Plan—At any point in time, the Coordination Unit may need to address a variety of issues. How does it decide what to do? A weekly internal Activity Plan will help to ensure that the right activities are prioritized.

8.1 A PPD’s Start-Up Phase

Early excitement and even initial euphoria for a PPD often emerges. However, this enthusiasm can quickly disappear if the dialogue process stalls. This highlights how a transition from start-up can sometimes be lengthy and frustrating. Below we suggest steps the Coordination Unit can take to help ensure that a PPD gets off to a good start.

Building the Foundation—Suggested Steps

- Obtain agreement and buy-in quickly on the rules of engagement—and make sure there are rules!

CHECKLIST Making Choices and Getting Through a Day or a Week in the Coordination Unit

What does a Coordination Unit do at any given moment, and how does it decide what to do? These decisions may seem innocuous but they are key for the PPD’s success. A weekly Activity Plan can help to focus and prioritize efforts from among a wide variety of potential tasks:

- Finalizing and sending meeting minutes
- Agreeing a meeting agenda
- Venue selection and logistics for events
- Working the phone in advance of a meeting or event
- Supporting Working Group members in engaging their constituents
- Carrying out research and analysis on an issue, including international benchmarking and planning local Focus Groups
- Arranging media participation at a PPD event
- Organizing a meeting between the Steering Committee Chair and a key decision-maker
- Finalizing a reform proposal for Steering Committee review
- Packaging and sharing information for the attention of PPD leaders
- Creating or updating a stakeholder or information database
- Drafting a Monthly or Quarterly Report
- Representing the PPD at a public event
- Seeking external assistance from the Development Partner community
- Checking and monitoring progress
- Liaising with the reform team to check progress
• Obtain the commitment of PPD members on the issues agenda and the process for engagement.
• Ensure clarity about the roles and responsibilities of Working Group and Steering Committee members, including as PPD Champions within their own constituencies.
• Generate commitment to issue filtering and rigorous issue selection.
• Add ideas of your own when Working Groups may be struggling.
• Do what is needed (and more) in-between meetings—this includes building formal and informal relationships with Working Group and Steering Committee leaders.
• Be deliberate in keeping members informed.

The Coordination Unit should generate commitment to a Process. A PPD’s commitment to process and structure will help it withstand the departure of one or more key individual Champions. Practical tools that reflect process and structure include the following:

• Establish guidelines for how the PPD will operate.
• Develop TORs for the Steering Committee and Working Groups, including criteria for selection, service and replacement.
• Define the roles of Steering Committee and Working Group leaders.

BOX 8.1 Innovative Secretariat Units: The Example of Liberia

The Liberia Better Business Forum (LBBF), supported by the International Finance Corporation (IFC), has generated meaningful benefits for the country’s private sector. It has also achieved a number of less tangible or “soft” outputs, from its most recent year of activity. These soft outputs have helped raise the LBBF’s profile and cement its importance among key government decision-makers. They include:

1. Preparing and delivering a “road show” with several government ministries, consisting of field visits around the country to update local businesspeople on new reforms and learn of business persons’ views about enabling environment challenges. The objectives of the Country Road Show included explaining the Micro- Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprise (MSME) Policy, encouraging business formalization and tax compliance, explaining the tax clearance process, and building relationships with key stakeholders in rural communities.

2. A national MSME Conference, the first-of-its-kind, resulted in new commitments of support from the government and an opportunity for a wide range of stakeholders to engage and exchange views. The conference brought together over 700 attendees, including from various national and international establishments, as well as public and private institutions. The President of Liberia, H.E. Madam Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, opened the conference with several new initiatives to facilitate the development of small business in Liberia.

• Establish criteria for selecting issues.
• Establish an approach for filtering issues.
• Set standards for carrying out research & analysis.
• Establish a consistent format for PPD position papers.
• Establish the format and content of PPD reporting.
• Put in place a system for effective issues tracking.

8.2 A PPD’s Transfer Phase

The Coordination Unit will play an important role in the negotiation of the “Sustainability Plan” that will outline the PPD’s transition from sponsor/DP support to local support and its eventual implementation.

As mentioned above in this note, from the start, a PPD should aim to move towards being funded by local participants—ideally by contributions from the private sector that will promote sustainable and local ownership. This helps to ensure that the Coordination Unit follows best practice by balancing the unit’s local fit and sustainability. Our previous Practical Note, Sustainability of Public-Private Dialogue Initiatives: Practical Note to Ensure the Sustainability of the Dialogue Partnership1 looks at this “transfer” from sponsor/DP support to self-sustainability in detail. It emphasizes how critical it is to address transfer in the early stages of a PPD, where the sponsor/DP, Coordination Unit and its membership together begin to consider and specify what an “exit strategy” will entail and how and what the PPD will transition to, including how the PPD will finance itself in its new local capacity.

“Managing a PPD transition is about managing a change process. It is a process where the PPD is being moved from its current state, with high donor dependence, toward a more independent state, owned by local entities. Accordingly, a PPD transition strategy needs to be carefully planned over an extended period of time. If the transition has been discussed with stakeholders at the start of the project, the change process will be smooth, since it is a matter of implementing an already agreed to strategic plan.”2

Because a PPD runs the risk of having no staff to manage the Coordination Unit once the sponsor’s funding ends, to ensure continuity of the unit, the following should be considered:3

**Reporting Line:** According to their contract, consultants’ reporting line lies with the program manager in the sponsor’s organization. However, this does not contribute to creating a sense of ownership of the PPD or a smooth management of the PPD. If the PPD has a Steering Committee, it is recommended that the recruitment of consultants involve the members and that new staff report directly to the Steering Committee.

**Consultant’s Office:** To encourage ownership and transfer knowledge, it is important to have consultants work from the PPD Coordination Unit hosted in a local institution rather than in a sponsor’s office. They should present themselves either as an independent consultant or as the Coordinator of the PPD initiative. Often, consultants work from the sponsor’s office and present themselves as staff of the donor organization. This tends to reinforce the perception that the project is externally-driven and may create confusion among
stakeholders as to whether the consultant is working for the PPD or for the sponsor.

In addition to these challenges there are other obstacles that can impede a successful transition and warrant attention:

- Maintaining capacity of the new Coordination Unit—low capacity of the business associations/chambers, combined with the lack of capacity to carry out important reforms (identification, research, and advocacy) can vary considerably and undermine the process and its success.
- Maintaining credibility and effectiveness of the dialogue process—the transition phase requires a lot of effort from the Coordination Unit and Champions. Trust and respect in the PPD process from all the stakeholders and parties must be strengthened.
- Generating long-term financial sustainability—the interest and involvement of other sponsors/DPs in the sustainability of the dialogue process.

Notes

2. Ibid. p. 10.
3. Ibid. p. 6.
4. Ibid. p. 16.
Chapter 9

Capacity Building of the Coordination Unit

To strengthen the Coordination Unit of PPD initiatives, the WBG has developed a number of training materials to help stakeholders engage efficiently in their respective dialogues.

9.1 Orientation Workshop

Participants: Stakeholders of the PPD, Media, Civil Society Organizations

Learning Objectives: The objective of the orientation workshop is to present the structure of the PPD, explain to stakeholders how they will engage and who their focal points are. Members of the public and private sectors should be informed on how the dialogue will be carried out and how they can continue to discuss issues that matter to them. During the workshop, roles and responsibilities are detailed and the mandate is discussed. The presenter(s) can also present other examples of PPDs worldwide and what they have achieved so far in order to illustrate the benefits and risks of PPD. This is usually a 2–3 hour orientation workshop with different groups of stakeholders. Presenters include the chair of the Steering Committee, champions, co-chairs
and Coordination Unit staff of the PPD. Stakeholders also include the members of the legislative bodies, opposition parties, the media, CSOs and other stakeholders.

[Workshop materials to be developed by each PPD using some building block presentations available on the www.publicprivatedialogue.org website].

9.2 Capacity Building of the Coordination Unit (Administrative Process)

Participants: Staff of Business Membership Organizations, PPD Coordination Unit

Learning objectives: A series of training workshops can be provided for selected BMOs in order to strengthen their capacity to operate an efficient Coordination Unit for private sector working groups as a driving force of the PPD. Following an overview of how the PPD operates and what it aims to achieve, the workshop should provide a step-by-step guide to all administrative procedures needed to support the PPD Coordination Unit.

The objectives are defined as follows:

- Serve to build the necessary administrative capacity in selected BMOs and Working Groups’ Coordination Unit.
- Ensure that the government of the country will find an organized private sector as a partner in the dialogue process.
- Strengthen the administrative role of the Coordination Unit, such as planning, delivery and follow up of PPD meetings (agenda, documentation, minutes), emphasizing the crucial role the PPD Coordination Unit plays for an effective dialogue.

[Training materials are available on the PPD website at www.publicprivatedialogue.org].

9.3 Communication

Participants: Staff of the PPD Coordination Unit, Staff of Business Membership Organizations

Learning objectives: The objective of the course is to provide skills to staff of the PPD Coordination Unit and staff of BMOs on how to communicate about reforms, and how to garner support for the private sector’s proposals.

The one-day workshop aims at helping staff:

- Realize the need to obtain support for a reform through a well-coordinated communication and outreach campaign
- Grasp the concept of communication and learn from other PPD communication campaigns
- Initiate a communication plan and develop a 12-month communication plan on one specific reform

[Training materials are available on the PPD website at www.publicprivatedialogue.org].
9.4 Advocacy

**Participants:** Staff of the PPD Coordination Unit, Staff of Business Membership Organizations

**Learning objectives:** The objective of the one-day training course is to improve PPD Coordination Unit and BMOs’ ability to engage in policy advocacy. This includes handling the building blocks that are needed to develop and sustain an effective policy advocacy. The session provides practical knowledge on how to develop and implement strategic and operational initiatives with respect to policy advocacy.

[Training materials are available on the PPD website].

9.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

**Participants:** Staff of the PPD Coordination Unit, Staff of Business Membership Organizations

**Learning Objectives:** The objective of the one-day session is to understand the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for PPD and to initiate the implementation of a system to collect evidence and measure outcomes of the PPD. The session will introduce the four PPD M&E evaluation tools: the evaluation wheel, the scorecard, the impact on the reform process, and measuring the economic/social impact.

[Training materials are available on the PPD website].

9.6 Business Association Strengthening Program

**Participants:** Staff of the PPD Coordination Unit, Staff of Business Membership Organizations

**Learning Objectives:** Many partners, such as the Center for International Private Enterprise, the Confederation of Danish Industry, the International Labor Organization, SEQUA, GIZ, etc., are providing capacity building exercises to BMOs. The objectives of these training sessions are to help structure the BMOs so that they are well governed and can generate enough revenues to sustain their objectives. Examples of training topics:

- Recruiting and retaining membership
- Developing and managing services
- Becoming a successful business training provider
- Developing effective advocacy
- Developing a strategy and business planning
Appendix

TORs for Coordination Unit Set Up¹

(From the 2006 PPD Handbook, ANNEX C6: Sample Terms of References for setting up a Coordination Unit to promote and manage a PPD)

The purpose of the Coordination Unit is to facilitate a constructive dialogue between the government and the business community, both foreign and domestic, and thereby improve the investment climate, stimulate private sector development in [name of country] to raise employment and improve peoples’ lives.

To raise the quality of the government-private sector dialogue and to monitor progress on issues raised by the private sector, the Coordination Unit will facilitate and coordinate interaction within and between the private sector working groups as well as between the joint government-private sector working groups.

The Coordination Unit will coordinate its overall activities with [insert names of relevant institutions] and assist in organizing joint government-private sector working group meetings and a bi-annual Forum.

The Coordination Unit will ensure that initiatives and issues emanating from the private sector are appropriately identified, are broadly representative, are adequately researched and are presented to the government through the joint government-private sector working groups in a focused, solutions-oriented manner.

The Coordination Unit will monitor discussion of issues raised, implementation of potential solutions and disseminate information to the working groups and the broader community of businesses, multilateral institutions and donors.

The Coordination Unit will have no decision-making or policy-making powers.

The impact of the Coordination Unit will be measured by the extent to which coordination and communication within and between the working groups is considered effective and efficient.

Longer term indicators of success would be the degree of participation by the business community in the dialogue process and improvement in the business environment, leading to higher foreign and local investment activity.

Tasks and Responsibilities

Promote a strong public-private partnership between the government and local and foreign businesses by acting as a neutral honest broker between the various parties.
Promote the government-private sector dialogue within the business community to broaden and deepen private sector participation in the process, especially from local businesses.

Act as a resource center for private sector-led initiatives. The Coordination Unit will report to the Steering Committee. [Include a paragraph on the composition of the Steering Committee].

[The following are sample staff positions and responsibilities of a Private Sector Forum Coordination Unit]

**Executive Director.** [Title could also be: Coordinator, Liaison Officer, Forum Manager, etc.] The executive director has a critical role for coordinating, facilitating, administering and otherwise providing structure and form to the PPD process. The Coordination Unit he or she heads is an important facility for providing resources to the entire Forum process. In addition to its administrative and other duties the coordinator will play the role of the “honest broker” for the entire dialogue process, and especially when working group dialogue process moves from earliest stages to maturity. He or she:

- Assures the overall leadership and management of the PPD activities, liaises with government and private sector, brokers access to funding for studies, etc.
- Consults with all stakeholders to determine their interests, willingness/ability to participate.
- Manages Coordination Unit’s professional and administrative staff.
- Formulates a detailed program and work plan, distributes necessary tasks, defines priorities and ensures implementation of program tasks by the Coordination Unit team in particular and other key PPD participants.
- Establishes and maintains working contacts and exchanges with the relevant public and private sector principal counterparts for the program.
- Secures support for the structure of the PPD and appropriate participation from the public and private actors.
- Arranges meetings between the government and private sector representatives to agree on the topics and agenda of the dialogue process and facilitates discussion during the meetings.
- Guides the working group in the completion of their stated objectives.
- Elaborates action plans; assists working groups in finding information on specific topics (seeking donor and government support for technical inputs when needed).
- Ensures that the partnership stays on course and that the suggestions agreed by the working groups are presented to the government and inform government policy.
- Prepares quarterly reports to participants, donors and counterparts; along with other reports which may be required, such as media briefings.
- With other team members, drafts articles, delivers presentations and speeches on reform approaches in each of the program areas.
- If the Coordination Unit is funding through technical assistance, prepares a plan for continuation of Coordination Unit function, and
recommend how the functioning of the PPD will be assured following the completion of technical assistance.

- Manages funding and is responsible for accountability, transparency and efficiency of the Coordination Unit and the initiative.

**Qualifications include:** strong neutral figure vis-à-vis the government and the private sector; relevant academic credential; experience in business, government, law or related profession in country and/or abroad; private sector management experience; demonstrated entrepreneurial spirit; knowledge of business environment reform programs, PPD processes and related communication programs.

**Private Sector Development Specialist.** [Title could also be: Policy Analyst, Business Reform Manager, Economist, etc.] The PSD Specialist assists the director with sorting through working group’s proposals, coordination or drafting of issues papers that emerge from working groups and elaborates on initial regulatory or policy proposals made by working groups or individual entrepreneurs, applying cost/benefit analysis to reform ideas. He or she:

- Participates in the implementation of the action plan or reform program.
- Participates in working group meetings and maintains dialogue and support to technical committees.
- Provides technical support to private sector participants on economic and policy analysis.
- Researches and drafts background papers and policy notes on issues identified by working committees, as needed on a demand-driven basis.
- Participates in the organization and execution of communication program.
- Conducts economic analysis of reform proposals as needed.
- With other team members, drafts articles, delivers presentations and speeches on reform approaches and institutional change in each of the program areas.
- Links to private sector, and to policy specialists in government institutions and within the donor community to ensure viability of proposed reforms.
- Assist the Executive director in other PPD related activities.

**Qualifications include:** Strong experience in policy analysis and formulation in areas relevant to investment climate; Knowledge of international good practice on private sector development; strong communication and advocacy skills; ability to interface effectively with government and private sector; strong teamwork and interpersonal skills.

**Other professional staff.** [This may include the following, depending on the specific needs of the PPD and the availability—or not—of other resources that could be drawn upon:

A Lawyer specialized in development economics—if the PPD is processing a lot of regulatory proposals, to ensure their compliance with best practice, their legal workability and to formulate the corresponding amendments.
A Public Service/Institutional Change Specialist—if the government is willing to integrate the findings and work process of the PPD in its institutional framework, to maintain working relationships with all institutional partners, create change management strategies and coordinate their implementation within the institutions.

A Regional Coordinator or a Sector specific coordinator—if the PPD has a strong regional focus and that some parts of the country are significant in term of economic activity but too remotely located; or if a partnership gives a particular emphasis to specific clusters of activities or to particular industrial activity, to manage the work on these regions or sectors.]

**Administrative Assistant.** [Could also fulfill the function of interpreter/translator if needed.] The Administrative Assistant has a key role in supporting the PPD activities and the Coordination Unit team. PPD dealings tend to produce a mass of detailed documentation, which the Assistant will help manage effectively. He or she:

- Manages the Coordination Unit office and deals with all logistics related to the Coordination Unit.
- Organizes plenary meetings and working group meetings.
- Handles sensitive correspondence, and ensures proper documenting of all Coordination Unit’s activities and dealings.

**Qualifications include:** Strong organization and interpersonal skills, good knowledge of local settings.

**Note**

1. From the 2006 PPD Handbook, Annex C6: Sample terms of references for setting up a Secretariat to promote and manage PPD, WBG.
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